

Filed: April 18, 2017

Filed on behalf of:

Patent Owner Intellectual Ventures I LLC

By: John R. King

Ted M. Cannon

Bridget A. Smith

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

2040 Main Street, 14th Floor

Irvine, CA 92614

Tel.: (949) 760-0404

Fax: (949) 760-9502

Email: BoxPGL40@knobbe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SYMANTEC CORPORATION

Petitioner,

v.

INTELLECTUAL VENTURES I LLC,

Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2016-01433

U.S. Patent No. 7,757,298

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	3
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	4
A. Legal standard	4
B. “unauthorized file”	5
C. “selecting”	8
IV. THE INSTITUTED CLAIMS ARE PATENTABLE OVER THE ALLEGED GROUNDS.....	10
A. The claims are patentable over the DeSouza and Hoffman combinations.	11
1. Symantec did not prove that Hoffman discloses characterizing unauthorized files.	11
2. Symantec did not prove that Hoffman discloses comparing an identification value of the selected file with identification values associated with unauthorized files.	16
3. Symantec did not prove that DeSouza teaches a computer or computer program “selecting a file.”.....	17
4. Symantec did not prove that a skilled artisan would have had a reason to combine DeSouza and Hoffman.....	21
B. The claims are patentable over the Hyppönen and Johnson combinations.	27
1. Prior Art Background.....	28
a. Hyppönen.....	28
b. Johnson	29
c. Kuo.....	31

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

	Page No.
d. Tate and Drake.....	33
2. Neither Hyppönen nor Johnson teaches “selecting [a] file based on whether the file comprises data beyond an end of data marker for the file.”	36
3. Symantec failed to prove that a skilled artisan would have had a reason to modify Hyppönen to select a file for virus scanning “based on whether the file comprises data beyond an end of data marker for the file.”	38
V. SYMANTEC CANNOT PROPERLY SUBMIT NEW OBVIOUSNESS EVIDENCE OR ARGUMENTS IN ITS REPLY	44
VI. CONCLUSION.....	45

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page No(s).

<i>Heart Failure Techs., LLC v. Cardiokinetix, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00183, Paper 12 (July 31, 2013)	21
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 417–18 (2007).....	21, 27
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxycorr, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	4
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)	4
<i>Poly-America, L.P. v. API Indus., Inc.</i> , 839 F.3d 1131 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	4
<i>In re Translogic Tech., Inc.</i> , 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	4

OTHER AUTHORITIES

37 C.F.R. § 42.100	4
77 Fed. Reg. 157	45

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	Definitions of part and portion, Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary 835, 896–97 (G.&C. Merriam Co. 1973)
2002	<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. HCC Insurance Holdings, Inc.</i> , No. 6:16-cv-00660, Exhibit A to Amended Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement (E.D. Tex. Apr. 4, 2016)
2003	<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. HCC Insurance Holdings, Inc.</i> , No. 6:16-cv-00660, Plaintiff Intellectual Ventures I LLC and Intellectual Ventures II LLC's Opening Claim Construction Brief (E.D. Tex. May 4, 2016)
2004	<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. HCC Insurance Holdings, Inc.</i> , No. 6:16-cv-00660, Plaintiff Intellectual Ventures I LLC and Intellectual Ventures II LLC's Reply Claim Construction Brief (E.D. Tex. May 25, 2016)
2005	<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. HCC Insurance Holdings, Inc.</i> , No. 6:16-cv-00660, Exhibit A to Joint Claim Construction Chart Pursuant to P.R. 4-5(D) (E.D. Tex. June 1, 2016)
2006	Declaration of David M. Goldschlag, Ph.D.
2007	CV of David M. Goldschlag, Ph.D.
2008	Definition of "Unauthorized," Merriam-Webster.com
2009	Definition of "Select," Merriam-Webster.com
2010	Deposition transcript of Jack Davidson (April 5, 2017)
2011	<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC, et al. v. Erie Indemnity Company, et al.</i> , No. 2017-1147, Brief for Appellants (Fed. Cir.)
2012	<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC, et al. v. Erie Indemnity Company, et al.</i> , No. 2017-1147, Brief for Defendants-Appellees (Fed. Cir.)

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.